

REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated September 9, 2003, 2003, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on December 9, 2003. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

In the specification, the paragraph beginning on page 13 line 29 has been amended to correct minor editorial problems.

Claims 1-19 remain pending in the application and are shown above. Claims 1-5, 7, 12-14 and 16-19 stand rejected and claims 6, 8-11 and 15 stand objected to by the Examiner. Reconsideration of the rejected claims is requested for reasons presented below.

Drawings

The drawings stand objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign mentioned in the description: "38", friction and/or sealing material. The drawings stand objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4) because reference character "48", figures 2a-2d has been used to designate both slots (specification page 18) and a collar (not described in the specification).

In Figures 2a-2d, one of the two reference characters 48 that previously designated different parts has been replaced with previously omitted reference character 38. Applicant submits that these amendments obviate the objection and add no new matter to the drawings. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests acceptance of the drawings.

Claims Objections

Claim 17 stands objected to because the following informality: "first" (line 3) lacks proper antecedent basis ("expandable" is written in line 1).

Claim 17 has been amended to correct the informality as suggested by the Examiner. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objection to claim 17.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Claims 1-5, 7, 13, 14, and 16-19 stand rejected under 37 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Nazzai et al. "Nazzai" (U.S. Patent No. 6,253,850).

The Examiner states that Nazzai discloses an apparatus for anchoring a first expandable, slotted (fig. 1) conduit or liner 14 capable of sustaining deformation to a second conduit or liner 12 using an inflatable device including an expander (co. 3, line 19-23). The reference also discloses a method of inflating a device to anchor concentric pipes, deflating (inherent), and removing (also inherent).

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection as applied to amended independent claims 1, 16 and 17. Nazzai discloses an inflatable member used as an expander itself that expands or reforms a tubular liner. There is no indication that the inflatable member can be used as an anchor for the tubular liner that is to be expanded by a separate expander. Therefore, Nazzai does not teach, show, or suggest an apparatus for anchoring a first conduit to a second conduit that includes an inflatable device for engaging with the first conduit, wherein the inflatable device is inflatable to facilitate anchoring of the first conduit to the second conduit and an expander device to expand a length of the first conduit, as recited in claim 1, and claims 2-5 and 8-14 dependent thereon. Further, Nazzai does not teach, show, or suggest a method of anchoring a first conduit to a second conduit that includes providing the first conduit, an expander device, and an inflatable device in contact with the first conduit, running the first conduit and inflatable device into the second conduit, inflating the inflatable device to facilitate anchoring of the first conduit to the second conduit, and expanding a length of the first conduit with the expander device, as recited in claim 16. Additionally, Nazzai does not teach, show, or suggest a method of anchoring an expandable conduit to a second conduit that includes providing the expandable conduit, running the expandable conduit into the second conduit, passing an assembly comprising an inflatable device and an expander into the expandable conduit, inflating the inflatable device to facilitate anchoring of the expandable conduit to the second conduit, and expanding a length of the expandable conduit with the expander device, as recited in claim 17 and claims 18-21 dependent thereon. Applicants have canceled claim 7 without prejudice. Withdrawal of the rejection of

claims 1-5, 7, 13-14 and 16-19 and allowance of claims 1-5, 8-14, and 16-19 is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 5 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Saltel (WO9706346).

The Examiner states that Saltel discloses an inflatable apparatus 1A for anchoring a first expandable conduit 1 to a second conduit or borehole (as defined by applicant in claim 5), and the apparatus near an end of the first conduit.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection as applied to amended independent claim 1. Saltel discloses an inflatable member used as an expander itself that expands a hardenable preform. There is no indication that the inflatable member can be used as an anchor for a tubular liner that is to be expanded by a separate expander. Therefore, Saltel does not teach, show, or suggest an apparatus for anchoring a first conduit to a second conduit that includes an inflatable device for engaging with the first conduit, wherein the inflatable device is inflatable to facilitate anchoring of the first conduit to the second conduit and an expander device to expand a length of the first conduit, as recited in claim 1, and claims 5 and 12 dependent thereon. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 6, 8-11, 13, 15 and 19 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicant has rewritten claims 6 and 15 in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Thus, Applicant requests withdrawal of the objection and allowance of claims 6 and 15. Applicant submits that dependent claims 8-11, 13 and 19 are in condition for allowance based at least on their dependency to the independent claims as amended and traversed herein.


Conclusion

The references cited by the Examiner, alone or in combination, do not teach, show, or suggest the invention as claimed.

The secondary references made of record are noted. However, it is believed that the secondary references are no more pertinent to the Applicant's disclosure than the primary references cited in the office action. Therefore, Applicant believes that a detailed discussion of the secondary references is not necessary for a full and complete response to this office action.

Having addressed all issues set out in the office action, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claims be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,



William B. Patterson
Registration No. 34,102
MOSER, PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.
3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500
Houston, TX 77056
Telephone: (713) 623-4844
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846
Attorney for Applicant

ANNOTATED SHEET SHOWING CHANGES

2 / 6

